Abstract

This paper presents the complete analysis of the problem of minimum-fuel aeroassisted transfer between coplanar elliptical orbits in the case where the orientation of the final orbit is free for selection in the optimization process. The comparison between the optimal pure propulsive transfer and the idealized aeroassisted transfer, by several passages through the atmosphere, is made. In the case where aeroassisted transfer provides fuel saving, a practical scheme for its realization by one passage is proposed. The maneuver consists of three phases: A deorbit phase for non zero entry angle, followed by an atmospheric fly-through with variable drag control and completed by a post atmospheric phase. An explicit guidance formula for drag control is derived and it is shown that the required exit speed for ascent to the final orbit can be obtained with a very high degree of accuracy.

1. Introduction

The problem of minimum-fuel aeroassisted transfer between orbits has received considerable attention in recent years. The case of transfer between coplanar circular orbits has received considerable attention in recent years. In this paper, we shall consider the case where the two terminal orbits are elliptical. More specifically, it is proposed to transfer, with a minimum fuel consumption, a vehicle from an initial elliptical orbit \( O_1 \) to a coplanar final elliptical orbit \( O_2 \). The two Keplerian orbits are about a spherical planet with center of attraction located at the point \( F \) (Fig. 1). The orbits are defined by the apocenter distances \( A_1 \), and the pericenter distances \( P_1 \). We shall assume that the orientation of the line of apsides is free for selection in the optimization process. This means that the argument of the pericenter of the final orbit is not of importance in the intended mission.

For a high-thrust propulsion system, it is assumed that the time interval for powered flight is short as compared to the orbital period. Hence, we can consider the velocity changes, upon the application of the thrust, as being instantaneous.

2. Idealized Optimal Transfers

We first consider the various optimal pure propulsive transfers and select the best for comparison with the most advantageous aeroassisted transfer in an idealized scheme. This is intended to display explicitly the circumstances under which aeroassisted transfer is a fuel saving mode. In the following sections, we shall provide an analysis of its practical realization.

For a pure propulsive transfer, since the orientation of the final orbit is free, in the optimal condition the terminal orbits are coaxial with peri-centers on the same side of the attracting center \( F \). For a finite-time transfer, the optimal mode is the Hohmann transfer connecting the higher apocenter to the pericenter of the other orbit. We shall consider the case where the apocenter of the initial orbit is higher, that is \( A_1 > A_2 \) and conveniently define the dimensionless lengths and characteristic velocities

\[
\alpha_1 = \frac{A_1}{R}, \quad \beta_1 = \frac{P_1}{R}, \quad v = \frac{V}{\sqrt{\mu/R}}, \quad \Delta v_i = \frac{\Delta V_i}{\sqrt{\mu/R}}
\]

(1)

where \( \mu \) is the gravitational constant of the planet and \( R \) is the radius of its surrounding atmosphere. The characteristic velocity of the Hohmann transfer, normalized with respect to the circular speed at distance \( R \), \( V_c = \sqrt{\mu R} = \sqrt{\mu/R} \), is...
If \( \sigma_1 \to \infty \), the initial approaching orbit is parabolic and the first impulse, applied at infinity or in practice at a large distance, is negligible. This leads to conceiving a parabolic transfer, even in the case where \( \sigma_1 \) is finite. The first accelerative impulse is applied at the pericenter of the first orbit to propel the vehicle into a parabola. At infinity, upon the application of an infinitesimal impulse, the vehicle returns by another parabola with the same pericenter as for the final orbit. Another decelerative impulse is applied at this center to complete the transfer. All the impulses are tangential and the total cost for this parabolic mode is

\[
\Delta v_{H} = \frac{\Delta v_{H}}{V_c} = 2\beta_1 - \sqrt{2\beta_1 \sigma_1 + \beta_1} - \sqrt{2\beta_2 \sigma_2 + \beta_2}
\]

or

\[
\Delta v_{H} = \frac{\Delta v_{H}}{V_c} = \sqrt{2\beta_1 \sigma_1 + \beta_1} - \sqrt{2\beta_2 \sigma_2 + \beta_2}
\]

If \( \sigma_1 \to \infty \), the initial approaching orbit is parabolic and the first impulse, applied at infinity or in practice at a large distance, is negligible. This leads to conceiving a parabolic transfer, even in the case where \( \sigma_1 \) is finite. The first accelerative impulse is applied at the pericenter of the first orbit to propel the vehicle into a parabola. At infinity, upon the application of an infinitesimal impulse, the vehicle returns by another parabola with the same pericenter as for the final orbit. Another decelerative impulse is applied at this center to complete the transfer. All the impulses are tangential and the total cost for this parabolic mode is

\[
\Delta v_{P} = \sqrt{2\beta_1} - \sqrt{2\beta_1 \sigma_1 + \beta_1} + \sqrt{2\beta_2} - \sqrt{2\beta_2 \sigma_2 + \beta_2}
\]

Upon direct comparison of the characteristic velocities, one can select the optimal pure propulsive mode.

For aeroassisted transfer, a decelerative impulse is applied tangentially at the apocenter of initial orbit to lower the pericenter to the top of the atmosphere. Its magnitude is

\[
\Delta v_{1} = \sqrt{2\beta_1} - \sqrt{2\beta_1 \sigma_1 + \beta_1} + \sqrt{2\beta_2} - \sqrt{2\beta_2 \sigma_2 + \beta_2}
\]

Near the top of the atmosphere, in the vicinity of the pericenter, atmospheric drag will work to reduce the apocenter to the distance \( A_2 \) where an accelerative impulse is applied to propel the vehicle into the final orbit. Its magnitude is

\[
\Delta v_{2} = \sqrt{2\beta_2} - \sqrt{2\beta_2 \sigma_2 + \beta_2}
\]

The total cost for this aeroassisted-elliptic mode is

\[
\Delta v_{AE} = \Delta v_{1} + \Delta v_{2}
\]

and it has to be compared with the best pure propulsive mode for optimality. Another way to bring the pericenter to the top of the atmosphere for the atmospheric decay process is to first send the vehicle into a parabolic orbit by a tangential and accelerative impulse applied at the pericenter of the initial orbit. Its magnitude is

\[
\Delta v_{AP} = \sqrt{2\beta_1} - \sqrt{2\beta_1 \sigma_1 + \beta_1} + \sqrt{2\beta_2} - \sqrt{2\beta_2 \sigma_2 + \beta_2}
\]

Then, at a large distance, we can return the vehicle for a grazing trajectory with a negligible impulse. The subsequent process of orbit decay and injection into the final orbit is as before and this time we have for this aeroassisted-parabolic mode

\[
\Delta v_{AP} = \Delta v_{1} + \Delta v_{2}
\]

By comparing the Eqs. (4) and (7), we deduce that for the two aeroassisted modes, the parabolic mode is more economical if

\[
\beta_1 \geq \frac{4(\sigma_1 + 1)}{\sigma_1}
\]

The aeroassisted transfer discussed in this section is based on an idealized scheme. It will require several passages through the atmosphere for \( A_1 \) to decrease to \( A_2 \). Furthermore, based on the theory of orbit contraction, it is assumed that during the decay process, the pericenter is nearly stationary. If this mode is optimal, the characteristic velocity computed is the idealized absolute minimum.

In the following sections we shall study the implementation of the aeroassisted transfer. We shall impose the constraint that the reduction of the apocenter occurs in a single passage. This requires a non-zero entry angle \( \gamma_e \) and exit angle \( \gamma_f \). The resulting total cost will be slightly higher.

The aeroassisted transfer consists of three phases:

The first phase is the deorbit phase. A propulsive maneuver is effected such that the vehicle enters the atmosphere, at distance \( R \), at a certain prescribed angle \( \gamma_1 \). This angle, which is very small, is selected such that within the drag capability of the vehicle, the necessary speed depletion can be accomplished in one passage.

The second phase is the atmospheric fly-through phase. We shall assume that the ballistic coefficient of the vehicle can be modulated between its maximum and minimum values. By a proper modulation of this coefficient, it is proposed to bring the vehicle to the best atmospheric exit condition for the vehicle to climb to the final apocenter for orbit insertion.

The third and final phase is the post atmospheric maneuver to put the vehicle into the final orbit.

It will be shown in a synthesis study that all the three phases are coupled. This means that the initial entry angle is selected based on the final orbit configuration and the drag capability of the vehicle during atmospheric passage. But, in terms of the fuel consumption, since the entry and exit angles are small, it is possible to analyze
separately the optimal maneuver for each phase. It will be shown that the resulting characteristic velocity for the combined maneuver is very close to the idealized minimum.

3. Entry at Prescribed Angle

In the deorbit phase, it is proposed to find the optimal descending trajectory which intersects the atmosphere, at distance \( R \) at a non-zero prescribed angle \( \gamma_e \). This can be achieved by applying a single, tangential and decelerative impulse at the apocenter of the initial orbit. From the geometry of the deorbit as shown in Fig. 2, the characteristic velocity for this one-impulse mode is

\[
\Delta v_1 = \sqrt{\frac{2\beta_1}{\alpha_1(\alpha_1 + \beta_1)}} - \sqrt{\frac{2(a_1 - 1)}{\alpha_1(\alpha_1 - \cos^2 \gamma_e)}} \cos \gamma_e
\]

The cost for deorbit increases as the entry angle increases.

Another alternative is to use parabolic orbits for deorbiting. In this case, an accelerative impulse is applied tangentially at the pericenter to send the vehicle into a parabola. Then at infinity, we can return the vehicle along another parabola for entry at any prescribed angle with an infinitesimal impulse. The characteristic velocity for this two-impulse mode is

\[
\Delta v_2 = \sqrt{\frac{2\beta_1}{\alpha_1(\alpha_1 - \cos^2 \gamma_e)}} - \sqrt{\frac{2(a_1 - 1)}{x(x + \beta_1)}} \cos \gamma_e
\]

The total characteristic velocity for this two-impulse deorbit is

\[
\Delta v_{II} = \Delta v_1 + \Delta v_2
\]

For given elements \((\alpha_1, \beta_1)\) of the initial orbit and entry angle \( \gamma_e \), this is a function of the outgoing distance \( x \). By minimizing the function with respect to \( x \), we are led to the necessary condition

\[
\sqrt{\frac{\beta_1(x-1)(\alpha_1 - \cos^2 \gamma_e)^3}{(x + \beta_1) \cos^2 \gamma_e}} = 2\sqrt{3x - 3x^2 + \cos^2 \gamma_e}
\]

Upon solving for \( x \) and using its value in Eqs. (12)-(14), we have the minimum characteristic velocity for the two-impulse mode.

We observe that, the one-impulse mode, when it becomes optimal, can be viewed as the limiting case of the two-impulse mode when \( x = \alpha_1 \). Hence, using this limit in Eq. (15), we have the condition for the two-impulse mode to be more economical than the one-impulse mode,

\[
\sqrt{\frac{\beta_1(\alpha_1 - 1)(\alpha_1 - \cos^2 \gamma_e)^3}{(\alpha_1 + \beta_1) \cos^2 \gamma_e}} \geq 2\alpha_1(\alpha_1 - 1) - (\alpha_1 - \cos^2 \gamma_e)
\]

In summary, the optimal mode depends on the parameters \( \alpha_1, \beta_1 \) and \( \gamma_e \). For a practical application, we first check condition (16). If the one impulse mode is better, then condition (11) can be used to decide the optimal mode. If the two-impulse mode is better, and if condition (11) is not satisfied, then the optimal mode is obviously the two-impulse mode.

As an example, we consider the case where the initial orbit is circular with radius \( r_1 \) and summarize the results in Fig. 3.
4. Explicit Guidance for Drag Modulation

We consider in this section the atmospheric phase in the aeroassisted maneuver. To begin this phase, the vehicle enters the atmosphere, at distance $R$ with a speed $V_e$ and entry angle $\gamma_e$. The atmospheric maneuver consists of using lift or drag modulation to bring the vehicle to exit at $\gamma_f = 0$ and with a resulting exit speed $V_f$ such that the apocenter of the ascending trajectory coincides with the apocenter of the final orbit (Fig. 4). In this way, the final impulse is minimized.

We shall use the density $\rho$ as the altitude variable and assume that this density is locally exponential, that is

$$\rho = \rho_e e^{-\frac{H}{g} \sin \gamma}$$

where the scale height $H$ can be adjusted for concordance with the standard atmosphere at the altitude range of the flight. Then, with the simplification (18) and by using the dimensionless variables

$$\frac{dy}{dt} = \left( \frac{V^2}{r} - g \right) \cos \gamma$$

Since the flight path angle stays small, (a few degrees), we can neglect the small gravity component $g \sin \gamma$ as compared to the acceleration due to the drag. Furthermore, we use the approximations

$$\sin \gamma = \gamma, \cos \gamma = 1, g(r) = g(R), \frac{V^2}{r} = \frac{V^2}{R}$$

These approximations induce an error of the same order as the error committed by neglecting the Coriolis force. It should be mentioned that the assumptions used are not necessary for the present analysis but they have the advantage of displaying explicitly the various effects of drag coefficient, entry speed and entry angle on the ballistic fly-through trajectory.

We shall consider the case where it is possible to modulate the ballistic drag coefficient between a lower and an upper limit. Using standard notation, we have the equations for ballistic flight inside a non-rotating planetary atmosphere.

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = V \sin \gamma$$

$$\frac{dV}{dt} = - \frac{\rho S C_D V^2}{2m} - g \sin \gamma$$

We notice that the last equation denoting the variation of the time is decoupled. The constant $6$ represents the effect of the entry speed with $6 = 1$ for circular entry and $6 = 0.5$ for parabolic entry. The parameter $\epsilon$ is the drag control parameter, subject to the constraint

$$\epsilon_{\text{min}} \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_{\text{max}}$$

In this way, the design of drag control is more flexible since it is not restricted to the variation of the drag coefficient $C_D$ alone. We simply assume that the dimensionless drag parameter $\epsilon$, as
defined in Eq. (21) can be configured to vary between two limits. The speed variable $x$ is such that, at the initial time, $x = 0$ and it is monotonically increasing, that is, larger $x$ for lower current speed. The altitude $y$ is such that initially $y = 1$ and it increases as the altitude decreases. At exit, we have $y_e = y_f = 1$. In the definition of the flight path angle variable $\Phi$, the ratio $R/H$ can be taken as 900 for the Earth’s atmosphere.

From the definition (20) of the dimensionless variables, we have at the initial time

$$0 = 0, \quad x = 0, \quad y_e = 1, \quad \Phi_e = -\sqrt{R/H}, \quad y_e = c > 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (25)

It is proposed to use the drag control $\epsilon$, subject to the constraint (24), to bring the vehicle to exit at

$$x = x_f, \quad y_f = 1, \quad \Phi_f = -\sqrt{R/H}/y_f$$  \hspace{1cm} (26)

such that

1. The apocenter distance of the ascending orbit is $A_2$.
2. The speed at this center is maximized.

The first condition is expressed as the constraint

$$v_f^2\left(a_2^2 - \cos^2 y_f\right) = 2a_2(a_2 - 1)$$  \hspace{1cm} (27)

where in terms of the speed variable $x$, we have

$$v_f^2 = \frac{1}{6} e^{-x_f}$$  \hspace{1cm} (28)

The second condition leads to the maximization of the performance index

$$J = \frac{v_f^2}{v_f^2 + \frac{2}{a_2} - 2} = \frac{2(a_2 - 1)\cos^2 y_f}{a_2(a_2^2 - \cos^2 y_f)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (29)

Since $a_2 = A_2/R$ is prescribed, this amounts to maximizing the final exit speed satisfying the condition (27). From this condition, we see that the best exit speed is obtained when $y_f = 0$, if this can be achieved. The resulting maximized exit speed is

$$v_f = \sqrt{\frac{2a_2}{a_2 + 1}} \hspace{1cm} (30)$$

For a drag modulation, grazing exit for a climb to apocenter is not possible\(^8\), and the optimal strategy consists of bang-bang control to achieve condition (27) with the smallest exit angle\(^1\). This control strategy is difficult to realize in practice since the switching time $\theta$ has to be very accurate, to within a fraction of one second to avoid crashing.

As an alternative, we propose the following drag control. First, a nominal trajectory is selected, with entry condition $y_e$ and $v_e$, such that during the atmospheric phase with a high drag coefficient $\epsilon = \epsilon_1$ for descent until $y = 0$, and a low drag coefficient $\epsilon = \epsilon_2$ for ascent until exit, we have a shallow exit angle and the trajectory overshoots the target apocenter. On the other hand, $y_e$ and $v_e$ are selected such that a trajectory with a constant high drag coefficient $\epsilon = \epsilon_1$ undershoots the target apocenter. The nominal drag coefficients $\epsilon_1$ and $\epsilon_2$ are selected to be consistent with the physical constraint $\epsilon_{\text{max}} \geq \epsilon_1 > \epsilon_2 \geq \epsilon_{\text{min}}$. These conditions ensure that in the actual trajectory, by using a modulated drag coefficient, $\epsilon = \text{variable}$, during the ascending phase we can achieve the required apocenter distance while obtaining a small exit angle.

Since it is difficult to control both $y_f$ and $v_f$ to satisfy Eq. (27) identically, our proposed explicit guidance scheme aims at controlling $v_f$. The reason for this is that, based on Eq. (27) for a sensitivity analysis, we have for small exit angle $\Delta \frac{\epsilon_2}{\epsilon_2 - \epsilon_1}$

\[
\frac{\Delta \phi_{\text{v}}}{\phi_{\text{v}}} = \frac{\Delta \phi_{\text{v}}}{\phi_{\text{v}}} \left[ \frac{(\epsilon_2 - 1)(\epsilon_2 v_f^2 - \Delta \phi_{\text{v}})}{\phi_{\text{v}}^2} \frac{\Delta \phi_{\text{v}}}{\phi_{\text{v}}} \right] \hspace{1cm} (31)
\]

The variation in the apocenter is more sensitive to the exit speed perturbation than to the exit angle perturbation.

To develop a variable drag control law, we consider a nominal skip trajectory as shown in Fig. 5. This trajectory, flown with $\epsilon = \epsilon_1$ until the bottom of the flight path, $y_b = 0$, and $\epsilon = \epsilon_2$ until exit, provides an exit speed $v_f^0$ and a flight path angle $\phi_f^o$. As mentioned above, this trajectory is designed to overshoot the terminal apocenter $A_2$. To have a correct distance $a_2$, we can use a higher variable drag coefficient $\epsilon$ during the ascent for an exit at $v_f$ and $\phi_f$ satisfying the constraint (27).

![Fig. 5. Nominal trajectory and controlled trajectory.](image)

We then select a value $y_f < y_f^0$ and compute the desired speed $v_f$ from Eq. (27). The objective is to obtain a formula for a variable $\epsilon$ such that at exit we have a resulting speed $\bar{v}_f = v_f$, with an exit angle $\bar{\phi}_f$ relatively close to the correct value $\phi_f$. In terms of the variables $x$ and $\Phi$, we use
the definition (20). Based on the first of the equations (22), during the ascent, from any current position, we can predict the exit speed, in the case where $\epsilon$ is held constant for the remainder of the trajectory, by integrating the equation until $y_f = 1$. An analytic solution is possible if we use an average value $\overline{\Phi}$ for the flight path angle variable. We have

$$y - 1 = - \frac{\Phi (x - x)}{\overline{\Phi} x_f}$$  \hspace{1cm} (32)

For the average value $\overline{\Phi}$, we can use the mean value between the current value $\Phi$ and the estimated exit value $\overline{\Phi}$. This leads us to use the control law

$$\epsilon = - \frac{(\Phi + \overline{\Phi}) (x - x_f)}{2(y - 1)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (33)

where $x_f$ is the desired final speed and $\overline{\Phi}$ is the estimated exit flight path angle variable. This control law is explicit since $\epsilon$ is continuously recomputed based on the current state, rather than on the deviation of the current state from a nominal current state. It remains to evaluate the estimated exit angle $\overline{\Phi}$. By combining the two equations (22), we have

$$\frac{dy}{y} = \frac{\Phi d \Phi}{(\delta e - 1)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (34)

By keeping $(\delta e - 1)$ constant, we neglect the effect of the variation of the speed. This is a good assumption since most of the speed depletion occurs during the descending phase at high drag coefficient. By integrating Eq. (34) from the lowest point, $y = y_b$, $\Phi = 0$, to exit $y = 1$, $x = x_f$, we have the estimated value for $\overline{\Phi}$

$$\overline{\Phi}^2 = 2 (1 - \delta e^{-x_f}) \log y_b + k$$  \hspace{1cm} (35)

In this equation, we have introduced an additive correctional term $k$ to compensate for the error incurred in neglecting the effect of the variation of the speed. This value $k$ is computed based on the nominal trajectory by using in Eq. (35) $\Phi = \Phi^0$, $x_f = x_f^0$. The key to the efficacy of this approach is that, for the family of skip trajectories under consideration, the flight path angle behavior is relatively uniform: the flight path angle is always small (a few degrees at most); and it is monotonically increasing during the guided portion of the flight which starts at $y = y_b = 0$. Consequently, the flight path angle is of minor importance in comparison with the speed. The connection of the guidance law with the nominal trajectory, since it is embodied in the constant $k$ which only affects the flight path angle, is minimal and does little to disrupt the explicit nature of the guidance law.

This explicit drag modulated control law has been tested numerically for several values of the entry speed ranging from parabolic entry, $\delta = 0.5$, to near circular entry, $\delta = 0.9$, with excellent results. The characteristic values for the ballistic drag coefficient selected are

$$\epsilon_{\text{max}} = 0.0030, \epsilon_1 = 0.0025, \epsilon_2 = 0.0005, \epsilon_{\text{min}} = 0.0002$$  \hspace{1cm} (36)

We can of course use the values $\epsilon_1$ and $\epsilon_2$ at $\epsilon_{\text{max}}$ and $\epsilon_{\text{min}}$ respectively in constructing the nominal trajectory. The main effect of the ratio $\epsilon_{\text{max}} / \epsilon_{\text{min}}$ is in the widening of the family of trajectories which can be accurately controlled. The numerical results are summarized in Tables 1 and 2.

In Table 1, we have the case of parabolic entry, $\delta = 0.5$, $v_e = \sqrt{2}$, $y_e = -3.82^0$. The drag sequence $\epsilon_1 \rightarrow \epsilon_2$ with switching at the bottom of the trajectory leads to $x_f^0 = 0.394717$, $y_f^0 = 2.8307^0$. We also have $y_b = 63.7253$ with the correctional term $k = 0.05284865$. In the table, $x_f$ is the required exit speed while $x_e$ is the actual resulting exit speed with the variable drag control law (33). We can see in the table that the speed control is excellent, not only near the nominal trajectory, but for a large range from high speed exit to low speed exit. The value $y_f$ is the one computed from Eq. (35). Using $x_f$ and $y_f$, we have computed $\overline{\Phi}$ from Eq. (27). Hence, using this table, we consider the problem as of controlling the vehicle for exit at $x_f$, $y_f$ for an ascent to $\overline{\Phi}$. The actual results are $x_f$, $y_f$ and $\overline{\Phi}$.

In Table 2, we have the case of $\delta = 0.577$, $v_e = 1.316473$, $y_e = -3.36^0$. This is essentially the entry speed for a direct return from a geosynchronous orbit. The relevant data from the nominal trajectory, $\epsilon_1 \rightarrow \epsilon_2$, are $x_f^0 = 0.307536$, $y_f^0 = 2.4787^0$, $y_b = 45.4944$ and $k = 0.04101062$.

Other cases of lower entry speed were tested with excellent results and it can be concluded that this explicit variable drag controls accurately the exit speed.

The variations of the drag coefficient $\epsilon$ during the controlled ascent are shown in Fig. 6 for the case of a return from a geosynchronous orbit. Typically, because we control the skip trajectory for an exit speed lower than the nominal exit speed, that is for $x_f > x_f^0$, the modulated flight for ascent starts at $y_b$ with an initial drag coefficient $\epsilon > \epsilon_2$.

For high speed exit, $\epsilon$ decreases continuously until exit, $y_f = 1$. For low speed exit, $\epsilon$ increases to provide more speed depletion. It should be mentioned that, by using variable drag coefficient during ascent, the sensitivity problem encountered in bang-bang control is removed. Here, the switching time is no longer a critical
Table 1. Accuracy analysis for adaptive drag modulation mode
Case of parabolic entry, $\delta = 0.5$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$x_f$</th>
<th>$\bar{x}_f$</th>
<th>$V_f/\bar{V}_f$</th>
<th>$\gamma_f$(deg.)</th>
<th>$\bar{\gamma}_f$(deg.)</th>
<th>$\Delta \gamma_f$(deg.)</th>
<th>$\sigma_2$</th>
<th>$\bar{\sigma}_2$</th>
<th>$\Delta \sigma_2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.400000</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>2.809575</td>
<td>2.798629</td>
<td>-0.010946</td>
<td>2.037951</td>
<td>2.037915</td>
<td>-0.000036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.425</td>
<td>0.425000</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>2.705810</td>
<td>2.703902</td>
<td>-0.001908</td>
<td>1.892964</td>
<td>1.892958</td>
<td>-0.000006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>0.450000</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>2.595113</td>
<td>2.604145</td>
<td>0.009328</td>
<td>1.764316</td>
<td>1.764349</td>
<td>0.000033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>0.475000</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>2.476482</td>
<td>2.498979</td>
<td>0.022497</td>
<td>1.649427</td>
<td>1.649512</td>
<td>0.000085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.500000</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>2.348635</td>
<td>2.388049</td>
<td>0.039416</td>
<td>1.546233</td>
<td>1.546392</td>
<td>0.000159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.525</td>
<td>0.525000</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>2.209885</td>
<td>2.271085</td>
<td>0.061200</td>
<td>1.453065</td>
<td>1.453329</td>
<td>0.000264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.550</td>
<td>0.550000</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>2.057932</td>
<td>2.148060</td>
<td>0.090128</td>
<td>1.368557</td>
<td>1.368978</td>
<td>0.000421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>0.575000</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>1.889486</td>
<td>2.019531</td>
<td>0.130445</td>
<td>1.291583</td>
<td>1.292253</td>
<td>0.000670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>0.600000</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>1.699530</td>
<td>1.887452</td>
<td>0.187922</td>
<td>1.221206</td>
<td>1.222305</td>
<td>0.001099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0.624998</td>
<td>0.999999</td>
<td>1.479658</td>
<td>1.757248</td>
<td>0.277590</td>
<td>1.156650</td>
<td>1.158582</td>
<td>0.001932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>0.649357</td>
<td>0.999679</td>
<td>1.213539</td>
<td>1.644051</td>
<td>0.430512</td>
<td>1.097286</td>
<td>1.102504</td>
<td>0.005218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Accuracy analysis for adaptive drag modulation mode
Case of direct return from geosynchronous orbit, $\delta = 0.577$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$x_f$</th>
<th>$\bar{x}_f$</th>
<th>$V_f/\bar{V}_f$</th>
<th>$\gamma_f$(deg.)</th>
<th>$\bar{\gamma}_f$(deg.)</th>
<th>$\Delta \gamma_f$(deg.)</th>
<th>$\sigma_2$</th>
<th>$\bar{\sigma}_2$</th>
<th>$\Delta \sigma_2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>0.325000</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>2.399299</td>
<td>2.398029</td>
<td>-0.001270</td>
<td>1.678884</td>
<td>1.678880</td>
<td>-0.000004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.350000</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>2.279466</td>
<td>2.290667</td>
<td>0.011120</td>
<td>1.572704</td>
<td>1.572746</td>
<td>0.000424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>0.375000</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>2.149113</td>
<td>2.176852</td>
<td>0.027739</td>
<td>1.476966</td>
<td>1.477077</td>
<td>0.000111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.400000</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>2.006688</td>
<td>2.056302</td>
<td>0.049614</td>
<td>1.390230</td>
<td>1.390445</td>
<td>0.000215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.425</td>
<td>0.425000</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>1.849303</td>
<td>1.928839</td>
<td>0.079536</td>
<td>1.311310</td>
<td>1.311688</td>
<td>0.000378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>0.450000</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>1.672627</td>
<td>1.795253</td>
<td>0.122626</td>
<td>1.239221</td>
<td>1.239876</td>
<td>0.000655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>0.475000</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>1.469588</td>
<td>1.658553</td>
<td>0.188965</td>
<td>1.173144</td>
<td>1.174321</td>
<td>0.001177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.499955</td>
<td>0.999978</td>
<td>1.227008</td>
<td>1.528180</td>
<td>0.301172</td>
<td>1.112400</td>
<td>1.114747</td>
<td>0.002347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.525</td>
<td>0.519449</td>
<td>0.997228</td>
<td>0.913699</td>
<td>1.444393</td>
<td>0.530694</td>
<td>1.056492</td>
<td>1.062457</td>
<td>0.005965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parameter in the process. By using the control law (33), even in the case where it is not started exactly at the lowest point, it is self-corrective by using the current state to adjust the drag and, as a consequence, leads to the desired exit speed.

5. Optimal Post Atmospheric Maneuver

We have seen in the previous section that at exit we have $v_f/\bar{V}_f$ leading to an apocenter distance $\bar{\sigma}_2$. If $\bar{\sigma}_2 = \sigma_2$, a final impulse, applied tangentially at this apocenter distance, is necessary for optimal orbit insertion. We consider the general case where $\bar{\sigma}_2 \neq \sigma_2$ and optimize this post atmospheric phase.

The case where we overshoot the target apocenter, $\bar{\sigma}_2 > \sigma_2$, is simple. The final orbit is achieved by a Hohmann transfer with an accelerative impulse at $\bar{\sigma}_2$ to raise the pericenter to the level $p_2$ and a decelerative impulse at this center to adjust $\sigma_2$ to the correct distance $\sigma_2$.

In the case where we undershoot the target apocenter, $\bar{\sigma}_2 < \sigma_2$, the first impulse $\Delta v_1$ is applied at the lowest point which is the exit point, to bring $\bar{\sigma}_2$ to $\sigma_2$. At this correct apocenter, a tangential and accelerative impulse $\Delta v_2$ is applied for orbit insertion. The velocity diagram at exit is shown in Fig. 7 with the Y-axis along the position vector.

Fig. 6. Variations of the drag coefficient $\epsilon$ for various exit speeds in the case of a return from a geosynchronous orbit.
In this system we have the components
\[ X = v_f \cos \gamma_f, \quad Y = v_f \sin \gamma_f \] (37)
of the exit velocity \( v \) resulting from drag modulated fly through and the components
\[ X = v_f \cos \gamma_f, \quad Y = v_f \sin \gamma_f \] (38)
of the correct velocity \( v_f \) required for attaining the final apocenter distance \( a_f \). Expressed in terms of \( X \) and \( Y \), we write the constraining relation (27)
\[ \sigma_2^2 \left( \sigma_2^2 - 1 \right) X^2 + \sigma_2^2 Y^2 - 2 \sigma_2 \left( \sigma_2^2 - 1 \right) = 0 \] (39)
Let \( \sigma_2 \) be the speed at the apocenter in the final orbit. The sum of the two impulses \( \Delta v_1 \) and \( \Delta v_2 \) required in post atmospheric maneuver is
\[ J = \sqrt{(X - \overline{X})^2 + (Y - \overline{Y})^2} + v_f - \frac{X}{\sigma_2} \] (40)
Taking account of the constraint (39) we introduce the Lagrange multiplier \( \lambda \) and minimize the augmented function
\[ I = J + \lambda \left[ \sigma_2^2 \left( \sigma_2^2 - 1 \right) X^2 + \sigma_2^2 Y^2 - 2 \sigma_2 \left( \sigma_2^2 - 1 \right) \right] \] (41)
The necessary conditions for a stationary value of \( I \) are
\[ \frac{\partial I}{\partial X} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial I}{\partial Y} = 0 \] (42)
Upon eliminating \( \lambda \) between these equations and simplifying the result, we obtain
\[ \overline{Y} - Y = \frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_2 - 1} \left( \frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_2 - 1} \right) \] (43)
where
\[ \frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_2 - 1} \] (44)
Define the components of the first impulse which is non tangential
\[ \Delta X = X - \overline{X}, \quad \Delta Y = Y - \overline{Y} \] (45)
From the linear equation (43), we deduce the optimal thrust angle
\[ \tan \psi = \frac{\Delta Y}{\Delta X} = \frac{k_1 \overline{Y}}{1 + k_1 \overline{X}} \] (46)
which can be immediately evaluated for given \( \sigma_2 \), \( \overline{v_f} \) and \( \overline{\gamma_f} \).
Let
\[ k_2 = \frac{\overline{Y}}{1 + k_1 \overline{X}} \] (47)
and write Eq. (43) as
\[ Y = k_2 \left( 1 + k_1 \overline{X} \right) \] (48)
Upon substituting into Eq. (39) and solving for the positive root, we obtain the solution
\[ X = \frac{k_2 \left( \sigma_2^2 - 1 \right) \sqrt{k_2^2 - \sigma_2^2 \left( \sigma_2^2 - 1 \right)}}{(\sigma_2^2 - 1) \left( 1 + \sigma_2 \sqrt{k_2^2 - \sigma_2^2 \left( \sigma_2^2 - 1 \right)} \right)} \] (49)
\[ Y = \frac{(\sigma_2^2 - 1) k_2 \left( 1 + \sigma_2 \sqrt{k_2^2 - \sigma_2^2 \left( \sigma_2^2 - 1 \right)} \right)}{(\sigma_2^2 - 1) + \sigma_2 \left( 1 + k_2 \right) k_2^2} \] (50)
With this solution the minimum characteristic velocity in post atmospheric flight is
\[ \Delta v_1 + \Delta v_2 = \sqrt{\frac{2 \sigma_2}{\sigma_2 + 1}} - \sqrt{\frac{2 \sigma_2}{\sigma_2 + 1} - \sqrt{\frac{2 \sigma_2^2}{\sigma_2 + 1} \left( 1 + k_1 \overline{X} \right)^2}} \] (51)
Hence, just as for the thrust angle, the minimum cost can be evaluated immediately in terms of \( \sigma_2 \), \( \overline{v_f} \) and \( \overline{\gamma_f} \) without having to go through intermediary steps. An elegant geometric solution based on hodograph theory has been given by Marchal.

6. Problem Synthesis

From the previous analysis, it is clear that for aeroassisted transfer, the three phases involved are coupled in terms of the total fuel consumption. The final apocenter distance and the drag capability dictate the selection of the entry elements \( \gamma_e \) and \( v_e \) which in turn influence the characteristic velocity for the deorbit phase. In this section, we shall prove the assertion that, as compared to the idealized case, which is not realistic in practice, the penalty in the fuel consumption using the present operating mode is small since the optimal condition has been realized in each phase.

We first compute the additional fuel consumption, in terms of the characteristic velocity, \( \delta(\Delta v) \), for a non zero entry angle \( \gamma_e \), as compared to the idealized grazing entry case.

If parabolic deorbit is optimal, then \( \gamma_e \) has no influence and trivially \( \delta(\Delta v) = 0 \). For a finite-
time deorbit, then when $\gamma_e = 0$, the optimal mode is always by one impulse. For $\gamma_e \neq 0$, there is a possibility of a two-impulse optimal mode, but even if it is the case, since $\gamma_e$ is small, the saving in the fuel consumption is small. Therefore, we compare the one impulse mode which can be optimal or non optimal for non zero $\gamma_e$, with the optimal one impulse for the idealized case where $\gamma_e = 0$. By comparing Eqs. (4) and (10) and linearizing for small $\gamma_e$, we have the additional characteristic velocity

$$
\delta(\Delta v) = \frac{a_1^2 \gamma_e^2}{2(a_1^2 - 1)} \sqrt{\frac{2}{a_1(a_1 + 1)}} = K(a_1) \gamma_e^2 
$$

(51)

The factor $K(a_1)$ is a function of the apocenter distance of the initial orbit. It is large only for $a_1 < 1$. But, this is not the case since aero-assisted transfer is only relevant for high initial orbit. Hence, this additional characteristic velocity is small since it is of the order of $\gamma_e^2$.

The additional fuel consumption for post atmospheric maneuver is due to non-zero exit angle. As has been mentioned above, this cannot be avoided due to the fact that for one-passage drag control, supercircular speed exit at zero exit angle is not possible. We first evaluate $\delta(\Delta v)$ for the undershoot case. For the idealized case, we have a single impulse applied at the correct apocenter with magnitude

$$
\Delta v_1 = v_2 = \sqrt{\frac{2}{a_2(a_2 + 1)}} 
$$

(52)

On the other hand, the minimum total characteristic velocity in post atmospheric flight for the undershoot case has been given in Eq. (50). Taking the difference, we have

$$
\delta(\Delta v) = \sqrt{\frac{2(a_2 + 1)}{a_2}} - \frac{1}{k} \sqrt{k \frac{2v^2 f}{v_2} + 2k_1 v_2 \cos \gamma_f + 1} 
$$

(53)

where $k_1$ is defined in Eq. (44) and $v_2$ and $\gamma_f$ are the actual exit speed and flight path angle resulting from the controlled atmospheric flight.

We recall that, in atmospheric flight, we select a small value $\gamma_f$ and control the drag to have an exit speed satisfying Eq. (27). To the order of $\gamma_f^2$, we have

$$
v_2^2 = \frac{2a_2(a_2 - 1)}{(a_2^2 - \cos^2 \gamma_f)} = \frac{2a_2}{a_2 + 1} \left[ 1 - \frac{\gamma_f^2}{2(a_2 - 1)} \right] 
$$

(54)

We have shown that we can accurately control this speed. Hence in Eq. (53), we can take $v_2 = v_f$ and compute

$$
k_1 v_f^2 + 2k_1 v_f \cos \gamma_f + 1 = \frac{\alpha_2^2}{(a_2 + 1)} - \frac{\alpha_2}{a_2 - 1} - \frac{\alpha_2}{2} \gamma_f 
$$

Since in the undershoot case $\gamma_f < \gamma_f'$, in the last equation, by taking $\gamma_f' = \gamma_f$, we have a conservative estimate of $\delta(\Delta v)$. Then, upon substituting into Eq. (53), we have

$$
\delta(\Delta v) = \frac{\alpha_2^2}{2(a_2 - 1)} \sqrt{\frac{2}{a_2(a_2 + 1)}} = K(a_2) \gamma_f^2 
$$

(55)

This has the same functional form as Eq. (51). Although here we have the case of small value of $a_2$, but when $a_2 = 1$, $\gamma_f$ is generally very small. For example, for an Earth orbit, taking the entry altitude at 120 km and for a very low final apocenter at 380 km, we have $R = 6498$ km, $A_2 = 6758$ km, and $a_2 = 1.04$ and the function $K$ has the value $K(a_2) = 6.4347$ and is still acceptable for low exit angle.

For the overshoot case, we first compute the miss distance $\Delta a_2 = a_2 - a_2' > 0$. From Eq. (31), with accurate control in the speed, $\Delta v_f = 0$, and with the aid of Eq. (54) for $v_2$, we have

$$
\frac{\Delta a_2}{a_2} = \frac{\gamma_f}{(a_2 - 1)} \gamma_f' \Delta v_f 
$$

(56)

This simple formula provides results in excellent agreement with the data in Tables 1 and 2.

For the overshoot case, post atmospheric maneuver is the usual Hohmann transfer using two impulses. Let $v_a$ be the speed of the vehicle at the overshoot apocenter distance $a_2'$. The characteristic velocity for the Hohmann transfer is

$$
\Delta v_{II} = \sqrt{\frac{2a_2(a_2 + 1)}{a_2 \beta_2(a_2 + \beta_2)}} - v_a \sqrt{\frac{2a_2}{a_2 \beta_2(a_2 + \beta_2)}} - \sqrt{\frac{2a_2}{a_2 \beta_2(a_2 + \beta_2)}} 
$$

(57)

Linearizing with respect to $\Delta a_2$, we have

$$
\Delta v_{II} = v_2 \left[ 1 - \frac{\Delta a_2}{2a_2} \right] - v_a 
$$

(58)

where

$$
v_2 = \sqrt{\frac{2a_2}{a_2 \beta_2(a_2 + \beta_2)}} 
$$

(59)

is the speed at the apocenter on the final orbit.

By comparing Eq. (58) with the idealized cost (52), we have the additional fuel consumption
Using Eq. (29) to evaluate $\bar{v}_a$, with $\sigma_2 = \bar{\sigma}_2$ and $v_f^2$ from Eq. (54), we have

$$v_a = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\sigma_2(\sigma_2^2+1)}} \left[ 1 - \frac{\sigma_2^2}{2(\sigma_2^2-1)} v_f^2 - \frac{(\sigma_2^2+1)}{2\sigma_2^2} \Delta \sigma_2 \right]$$

Then, upon substituting into Eq. (60) and using Eq. (56) for $\Delta \sigma_2 / \sigma_2$, we have the final expression

$$\delta (\Delta v) = K(\sigma_2) v_f^2 + \frac{v_f \Delta \gamma_f}{(\sigma_2-1)} \sqrt{\frac{2}{\sigma_2(\sigma_2^2+1)}} \sqrt{\frac{\beta_2}{\sigma_2+\beta_2}}$$

Since $K(\sigma_2)$ is the same as in Eq. (55), and the product $v_f^2 \gamma_f$ is very small, the penalty in the characteristic velocity for the overshoot case is the same as for the undershoot case.

To conclude this paper one final remark is in order. By inspection of Tables 1 and 2 one can observe that the control in the exit flight path angle is poorer for very low values of $\sigma_2$. This is of no real consequence since in practice one would not choose the particular nominal reference trajectory to control low values of $\sigma_2$. For example, recall that for Table 2 (entry from geosynchronous orbit) the nominal trajectory had an entry flight path angle $\gamma_e = -3.36^\circ$, leading to an exit at $\gamma_f = 2.4787^\circ$ for a speed of $v_e^2 = 1.128838$ and giving a nominal apocenter distance of $\sigma_2^0 = 1.760183$.

According to the formulation of the guidance algorithm this nominal trajectory is used to control the orbits with $\sigma_2$ slightly below this value. For low altitude final orbits, the nominal trajectory selected in practice would have a steeper entry angle than $\gamma_e = -3.36^\circ$ which then would yield a lower nominal apocenter distance. The control algorithm would then provide excellent accuracy in the exit flight angle as well as the exit speed. For values of $\sigma_2$ higher than those shown in Table 2, one would select a nominal trajectory with a more shallow entry flight path angle so as to give a higher nominal apocenter distance.
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